**REMARKS**

Claims 1-17, 19 and 21 are pending in the application.

Claims 1-17, 19 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by article titled, "Recommend-it.com: Spread the Word!!" in view of Netravali et al. (5,084,877).

The claims are amended, and, thus, the pending claims remain for reconsideration, which is requested.

The language of the claims provides "introduction origin system," "introduction destination system" and "introduction target system." The language of the claims also expressly specifies the relationship among these systems, which is not expressly or implicitly disclosed by Recommend-it.com. The language of the claims provides "***the introduction origin system … notifying the introduction destination system of introducing information containing user entry information of the introduction target system.***" Further, the language of the claims provide "***the introduction destination system … detecting registration of the user entry information of the introduction target system on the user list in the registering part and notifying the introduction target system of introduced information representing that a registration action based on introduction has been conducted.***" Further, the language of the claims provide "***the introduction target system … recognizing a registration action to the user list in the introduction destination system.***"

In other words, "Recommend-it.com" discusses that when a first user visits a target website, namely corresponding to the claimed "introduction target system," the first user can click on a "Recommend-it.com" link in the target website to be redirected to a Recommend-it.com website so the first user can complete a form, namely corresponding to the claimed "introduction origin system," to recommend the target website to a second user friend, namely corresponding to the claimed "introduction destination system." However, it is readily apparent that the language of the claims specifying the relationship of the three systems cannot correspond to Recommend-it.com relationships of systems, because in Recommend-it.com while the Recommend-it.com webpage notifies the second user friend about the target website recommended by the first user, there is no discussion expressly or implicitly about the second user friend, namely the "***introduction destination system … detecting registration … of the introduction target system on the user list … and notifying the introduction target system of introduced information representing that a registration action based on introduction***

8

*has been conducted*." Further, Recommend-it.com is silent on "*the introduction target system … recognizing a registration action to the user list in the introduction destination system*." A benefit of the embodiments is to establish an effective relationship between the second user friend and the target website, namely by "*the introduction destination system … notifying the introduction target system of introduced information representing that a registration action based on introduction has been conducted*" and "*the introduction target system … notifying the introduction destination system* of state information representing *a state of the introduction target system or a user thereof* … <u>*wherein the introduction destination system*</u> … displaying *the state of the introduction target system* based on the state information notified by the introduction target system."

It is readily apparent that Netravali does not disclose these features. Further, a prima facie case of obviousness based upon Recommend-it.com cannot be established, because nothing has been cited or found that Recommend-it.com expressly or implicitly discloses to one skilled in the art to modify Recommend-it.com's email notification to the second user friend about a target website recommended by a first user to provide "*the introduction destination system … detecting registration … of the introduction target system on the user list* … and *notifying the introduction target system of introduced information representing that a registration action based on introduction has been conducted*, … *the introduction target system … recognizing a registration action to the user list in the introduction destination system*," and seen a benefit of an effective relationship between the second user friend and the target website. In other words, page 4 of Recommend-it.com only discusses that the Recommend-it.com website emails the second user friend indicating that the first user has recommended the target website. Further, the Recommend-it.com website cannot correspond to the target website, because Recommend-it.com pages 2 and 4 expressly discuss being a service redirected from the target website. Further, Recommend-it.com discusses registration in relation to a target website registering with Recommend-it.com to include a link thereto in the target website (Recommend-it.com page 2 "Add this free service to your website in minutes!"), and in relation to the first user registering recommendation information at Recommend-it.com. Both of these Recommend-it.com registrations differ from the claimed "*the introduction destination system … detecting registration … of the introduction target system on the user list* … and *notifying the introduction target system of introduced information representing that a registration action based on introduction has been conducted*, … *the introduction target system … recognizing a registration action to the user list in the*

9

*introduction destination system*," providing a benefit of the second user friend registering with the target website. It is readily apparent that Recommend-it.com is silent on these features with regard to the claimed "introduction destination system" having a benefit of being a second user friend, in relation to "introduction target system."

Further, in contrast to Recommend-it.com, the language of amended claims provide "the introduction destination system comprising a registering part receiving the introducing information notified from the introducing part of the introduction origin system*, presenting a selection dialog for a user and registering user entry information of the introduction target system on a user list according to the user selection*," providing a benefit of a second user friend confirming or accepting establishing a relationship with the "introduction target system." It is readily apparent that Recommend-it.com on page 4 discusses the second user friend is only presented with "If you don't know Eileen Velvet, feel free to disregard this message or forward it to <mailto:security@recommend-it.com>," where the Recommend-it.com website is the introducer, after receiving the recommendation email, which indicates that the first user has recommended a target website and sent from the Recommend-it.com website. So Recommend-it.com fails to disclose expressly or implicitly and differs from presenting a selection dialog to the second user friend for *accepting establishing a relationship with the "introduction target system*" by "*the introduction destination system … detecting registration … of the introduction target system on the user list* … and *notifying the introduction target system of introduced information representing that a registration action based on introduction has been conducted*." In other words, Recommend-it.com is silent about david_ho@digidem.com, as the email recipient, notifying a target website of any registration action with respect to the target website, namely Recommend-it.com fails to expressly or implicitly discuss david_ho@digidem.com notifying WebDeck Software website of any registration action and "*the introduction target system … recognizing a registration action to the user list in the introduction destination system*," while in Recommend-it.com, the security@recommend-it.com email address is not the target website.

Further, in contrast to Recommend-it.com, the language of amended claims provide "a state information notifying part notifying the introduction destination system of state information representing a state of the introduction target system or a user thereof, wherein the introduction destination system further comprising a state information display part displaying the state of the introduction target system based on the state information notified by the introduction target system." The Office Action acknowledges that Recommend-it.com does not disclose the

claimed target system notifying state information to the destination system, so the Office Action relies upon Netravali. Netravali discusses "When it is detected that the transmitter has not sent a control packet within a predetermined time interval, the system enters the DISC state and ceases operations," which differs from the claimed "***notifying the introduction destination system*** of state information representing ***a state of the introduction target system or a user thereof*** ... <u>***wherein the introduction destination system***</u> ... ***displaying the state of the introduction target system*** based on the state information notified by the introduction target system." Further, nothing has been cited or found in Recommend-it.com and Netravali that discloses to one skilled in the art to combine Recommend-it.com and Netravali, both of which are silent on any state information notification from a target web site to another system, to provide the claimed "***notifying the introduction destination system*** of state information representing ***a state of the introduction target system or a user thereof*** ... <u>***wherein the introduction destination system***</u> ... displaying ***the state of the introduction target system*** based on the state information notified by the introduction target system."

Withdrawal of the rejection of claim 1 and allowance of claim 1 is requested.

Independent claim 19 requires similar limitations to amended independent claim 1 and is allowable for similar rationale.

DEPENDENT CLAIM 21:

Further dependent claim 21 is allowable, which further specifies the established relationship between the "introduction target system" and "the introduction destination system," which as discussed above is not disclosed by Recommend-it.com. In other words, Recommend-it.com and Netravali are silent on "the registering part of the introduction destination system further comprises an ***introduced update information notifying part periodically notifying the introduction target system*** ... ***that the registration of the user entry information of the introduction target system in the registering part is effective***, and the ***introduction recognizing part of the introduction target system further*** ... ***determining effectiveness of the registration of the user entry information***." The Office Action does not provide a rejection rationale for dependent claim 21, thus it is submitted this claim is in condition for allowance.

Other dependent claims recite patentably distinguishing feature of their own, or are at least patentably distinguishing due to their dependencies from the independent claims.

CONCLUSION

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the

application is in condition for allowance.  An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,
STAAS & HALSEY LLP

/Mehdi D. Sheikerz/

Date: _____November 29, 2008_____        By: _____
                                               Mehdi D. Sheikerz
                                               Registration No.  41,307

1201 New York Avenue, N.W., 7th Floor
Washington, D.C.  20005
Telephone:  (202) 434-1500
Facsimile:  (202) 434-1501